



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,474	06/28/2001	David L. Bradford	BS00-403	3319

28970 7590 08/13/2004

SHAW PITTMAN
IP GROUP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 1300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

NGUYEN BA, PAUL H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/892,474

Applicant(s)

BRADFORD, DAVID L.

Examiner

Paul Nguyen-Ba

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. This action is responsive to General Power of Attorney by Assignee and Exclusion of Inventive Entity filed on June 30, 2004.
2. Claims 1-28 have been considered. Claims 1, 8, 14, 18, and 23 are independent claims.

Priority

3. This application claims benefit of provisional patent application 60/286,967 under 35 U.S.C. 119(e).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miles, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0111842.

Independent Claim 1

Miles teaches a system for managing work orders using priorities, comprising:

a work-order entry computer for entering a plurality of work-orders (see Abstract; [190];

Fig. 62 → i.e. “work order entry screen”);

a database management system...plurality of work orders (see Abstract → central database);

a work order management computer (see Abstract);

a time estimation process...the work order (see [211], [213]; see also Figs. 101, 103, and 105-116 → estimated number of hours the resource will be used on a work order); and

a graphical user interface...update...database management system (see [0014], [0148], [0149], [213]; see also Figs. 6-8).

Miles does not specifically teach allocating a pre-determined number of priorities for a pre-determined number of priority levels. However, Miles teaches *a priority assigning process...entered work orders* (Figs. 73, 74, 94, 95, and 100; see pg. 9 - claim 12 → “Work Order Default Screen” has priority levels of low, medium, and high). It was commonly known and would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art that each priority level in a work order system should have a predetermined allocation limit for the purpose of not rendering the priority level function obsolete by allowing every work order to have the same priority level.

Claim 2

Miles teaches the system wherein the *priority assigning processes tracks priority usage for each engineer that assigns a priority to a work order* (see [0004]; see also Figs. 103, 105-116

→ system tracks the priority of the work order (low, medium, or high), the employee assigned the priority work order, as well as the details of its status).

Claim 3

Miles teaches the system wherein a *user can use the graphical user interface to request a report...database management system* (see [214]-[218]; see also Figs. 104-116).

Claim 4

Miles teaches the system wherein the *graphical user interface includes a schedule window which the user can use to enter a search to extract...work order information stored in the database management system* (see [0008], [0208], and [0209]; see also Figs. 87-90 → i.e. “Advanced Search” option from the “Work Order Screen”).

Claim 5

Miles teaches the system wherein the *graphical user interface is a web browser* (see Abstract).

Claims 6, 7, 12, 13, and 25

Miles teaches the system and method wherein *the work-order information is updated* (see [0014], [148], [149], [213]), but does not specifically teach a concrete timeframe for the updates. However, Miles teaches that the updates can be requested by the vendors or by the customer users (see [0014], [148], [149], [213]). It was commonly known to those of ordinary skill in the art that automatic periodic or daily updates are used in work order systems for the purpose of keeping the information in the database as recent and as up-to-date as possible.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to update the work-order information periodically or daily for the purpose of keeping the information in the database as recent and as up-to-date as possible.

Independent Claim 8

Independent *method* claim 8 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as Independent *system* claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 9

Method claim 9 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as system claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 10

Method claim 10 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as system claim 3, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 11

Method claim 11 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as system claim 4, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Independent Claim 14

Independent claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as Independent claim 1 and dependent claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 15

Miles teaches the system wherein the *graphical user interface...user can query the database...data in a report* (see [214]-[218]; see also Figs. 104-116).

Art Unit: 2176

Claim 16

Miles teaches the system with respect to independent claim 14 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach the system wherein *the user computer decrements the number of priorities..., and increments the number of priorities...when the work order is completed.*

However, Miles teaches *a priority assigning process...entered work orders* (Figs. 73, 74, 94, 95, and 100; see pg. 9 - claim 12 → “Work Order Default Screen” has priority levels of low, medium, and high). It was commonly known and would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art that since each priority level in a work order system should have a predetermined allocation limit, the allocated number of priorities for each level should be monitored with a basic counter increment or decrement for the purpose of keeping track of the slots available per priority level, and ultimately, not rendering the priority level function obsolete by allowing every work order to have the same priority level.

Claim 17

Miles teaches the system wherein *the report is a priority report showing the user's use of priorities* (see [214]-[218]; see also Fig. 115).

Independent Claim 18

Independent *method* claim 18 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as Independent *system* claim 14, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 19

Method claim 19 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as system claim 15, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 20

Method claim 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as system claim 2, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 21

Method claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as system claim 16, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 22

Method claim 22 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as system claim 17, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Independent Claim 23

Independent claim 23 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as Independent claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Claim 24 and 28

Miles teaches the system for *tracking the time remaining to complete the work order on a continuing basis; means of determining a series of tasks to complete the work order; means for assigning a time required to complete each task; and means for summing the time...to estimate the time required to complete the work order* (see Abstract, Brief Summary, [213]; see also Figs. 101, 103, 105-116).

Claim 26

Miles teaches the system with respect to independent claim 23 as discussed above, but does not specifically teach allocating a pre-determined number of priorities for a pre-determined number of priority levels. However, Miles teaches *a priority assigning process...entered work*

Art Unit: 2176

orders (Figs. 73, 74, 94, 95, and 100; see pg. 9 - claim 12 → “Work Order Default Screen” has priority levels of low, medium, and high). It was commonly known and would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art that each priority level in a work order system should have a predetermined allocation limit for the purpose of not rendering the priority level function obsolete by allowing every work order to have the same priority level.

Claim 27

Claim 27 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claim 16, and is rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US 6115640 A	USPAT20000905	Tarumi, Hiroyuki
US 5093794 A	USPAT19920303	Howie, George R. et al.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (703) 305-8776.

The examiner can normally be reached from 10:30 am - 7:00 pm.

Art Unit: 2176

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PNB


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER